approximately as a low. That is why in order to protect the interest of the Aam Aadmi, the Government decided to pass the minimum burden of these high prices to the consumers. Consequently, the Government and upstream Oil PSUs had to share maximum under-recovery burden. So, Sir, in the light of these incidents that happened, these royalties to particular States, such as Gujarat, Assam, Arunachal, Tamil Nadu became less and we tried to protect the interest of the Aam Aadmi and reduce the burden on them. That is why the burden-sharing fell on the upstream companies.

श्री नतुजी हालाजी ठाकोर : माननीय मंत्री जी जो जवाब दिया है, वह सब्सिडी के आधार पर दिया है लेकिन वह उनका आंतरिक मामला है। जो रॉयल्टी देने का सरकार का अभिगम है, उसमें यह बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। उससे गुजरात सरकार को 1500 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा हो रहा है। उसके संबंध में बार-बार गुजरात सरकार ने आपको अवगत कराया है लेकिन उसके बारे में अभी तक आपने कोई भी कार्य नहीं किया है। इस संबंध में आपने क्या किया है? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि गुजरात सरकार ने उपरोक्त अधिसूचनाओं और संकल्प के आधार पर रायल्टी के भुगतान के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार को अभ्यावेदन दिया है, इसके लिए सरकार ने क्या कार्रवाई की है?

SHRI JITIN PRASADA: Sir, as far as royalty on post-discount prices is concerned, the Central Government also took royalty on the post-discounted prices, and, as I said, because it was a year where there was a high volatility in prices and the Government was concerned with reducing the burden on the Aam Aadmi, we went in for this royalty on the post-discounted prices all across the country. The Central Government has already gone for that and same went for Gujarat, Assam; and all other States. That is why the post-discount prices were taken into account.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question Hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO STARRED QUESTIONS

Corruption in judiciary

†*121. SHRI LALIT KISHORE CHATURVEDI: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of cases of corruption in judiciary are coming to the fore;

(b) whether Government has looked into such complaints; if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is a fact that there is a lack of transparency at the time of appointments in judiciary which persists therein right from the appointment upto the retirement; and

(d) whether Government would consider to have ratification of appointments in judiciary in State courts done by the State Legislative Assemblies and in Supreme Court by Parliament?

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) to (d) Reports of alleged corruption in the judiciary have come to the notice of the Government from time to time.

The Chief Justice of India and the Chief Justice of a High Court has the competence, as per the 'in-house procedure' devised by the judiciary to receive and look into complaints against the conduct of a Judge of the Supreme Court and of the concerned High Court respectively.

As regards the members of Judicial Service of a State, under article 235 of the Constitution of India, the administrative control over the members of subordinate judiciary in the States vests with the concerned High Court and the State Government.

The appointment of Judges in the High Courts is, at present, made in terms of the Memorandum of Procedure for Appointment for Judges in the High Courts and Supreme Court which has been drawn up on the basis of the judgment delivered by the Supreme Court on October 6, 1993 in the case of Supreme Court Advocates on Record and Anr. Vs.Union of India and Anr. and their Advisory Opinion dated October 28, 1998. There has been criticism of the existing procedure by some bodies as well as experts.

There is no proposal before the Government to consider ratification of appointments in judiciary in State courts by State Legislative Assemblies and in Supreme Court by Parliament.

Survey on corruption in judicial system

†*127. SHRI AMIR ALAM KHAN: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government is aware of rampant corruption in the judicial system;

(b) if so, whether Government has carried out any survey in this regard;

(c) if so, the details thereof;

(d) how many cases of corruption against judges of Supreme Court/High Courts came to the light during the last three years and how many cases have been disposed of, out of them;

(e) whether Government proposes to establish some mechanism to reform the judicial system;

(f) if so, the details thereof; and

(g) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) to (g) Reports of alleged corruption in judiciary have come to the notice of the Government from time to time. No survey, however, has been carried out by the Government in this regard.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi